DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 299 EA 019 909

AUTHOR Pechman, Ellen M.; King, Jean A.
TITLE Analyzing the School Evaluation Use Process To Make Evaluation Worth the Effort.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Eduational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Utilization; *Innovation; Longitudinal Studies; *Organizational Theories; *School Districts; *School Organization; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a structure for assessing the school evaluation use process developed from a longitudinal case study of districtwide and school level evaluation procedures in a large urban school district. Two fundamental questions guided the study: (1) Why isn't the evaluation process more useful to decision-makers and practitioners? and (2) If it is not useful, is it worth the effort? In the absence of pertinent literature, research focused on people on the "front lines"--the teachers, principals, and project implementers. Central office managers, and evaluators were consulted to determine possible communication gaps. Data were collected over a 6-year period through formal and informal observation of activities and interviews with key actors responsible for implementing evaluation unit functions. Results showed that program evaluation in schools involves implementing a complex, innovative concept that for most school staff (including managers) is unfamiliar, confusing, and even intimidating. This means evaluation use is not a simple matter of reviewing recommendations and following through on suggested changes. In reality, the evaluation use process challenges people to modify their routines and design new ways of accommodating to changing job demands. After discussing evaluation and innovation, the structure of school evaluation use is explained and applications are outlined. As with other innovations, integrating evaluation into complex school organizations is evolutionary and likely to cause disruption. Even so, evaluation is well worth the effort. Included are two appendices and a bibliography of 43 references. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294299

ANALYZING THE SCHOOL EVALUATION USE PROCESS

TO MAKE EVALUATION WORTH THE EFFORT

Ellen M. Pechman
Lagniappe Associates
703D Daniels Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

Jean A. King
Department of Education
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California

April, 1986

EA 019 909

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen M Pechman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper describes a structure for assessing the school evaluation use process that was developed out of a longitudinal case study of districtwide and school level evaluation procedures in a large urban school district. Two fundamental questions guided our study: 1) If we know so much about evaluation procedures, why isn't the evaluation process more useful to district level and school site decision makers and practitioners? and 2) If it is not useful, is it worth the effort?

Our intuitive faith in educators and schools, combined with our persistent belief in the rational process, drove us to look for the logical structure of the process of evaluation use that has apparently been missed by evaluation researchers. Our search returned us again and again to school people on the "front lines", the teachers, principals and project implementers. In addition, we listened closely to central office managers to determine where there were communication gaps and, if possible, to learn their sources. Data were collected in three separate years over a six year period through formal and informal observations of activities and interviews with key actors responsible for implementing the functions of the districtwide evaluation units during this period. The investigation centered on the routine evaluation processes typically used in the school system.

A consistent theme that emerged from our interviews was that program evaluation in schools involves implementing a complex, innovative concept that for most school district personnel -- even central office managers and evaluators -- is unfamiliar, confusing, and often intimidating. This contrasts with our expectation that evaluation use is a simple matter of reviewing recommendations and following through on suggested changes. In reality, the use of the evaluation process in school settings is a challenge requiring people to modify their routines and to design new ways of accommodating to job demands that may change as a result of the evaluation process. This involves making behavioral change at a fundamental level, a level that for most of us is difficult to attain.

Our grounded data pointed to two underlying phenomena. First, we observed, as have Lindblom and Cohen (1982), that analytical processes that are second nature to evaluators and researchers are quite foreign and mysterious to child- and school-oriented practitioners. A close observer of the school district shared an alternative rationality for using evaluations that was typical in the system we observed: "The implicit purpose of evaluation and testing in this system is to justify what you want to do and to eliminate what you don't want to see. It's not to solve a problem. It's to meet an agenda. One's frame of reference permits any set of data to be used to make a cogent argument. As a result, you can support your own point of view with almost any information" (Field Notes, December 6, 1985).

Second, organizational learning, like human learning, occurs developmentally, requiring adjustment of the operational processes

within the organization and, at the same time, basic skills acquisition among individual workers (Comfort, 1982). As such, the learning process for individuals and organizations is gradual and needs to be nurtured, as does any meaningful learning that leads to substantial growth and change.

Evaluation as Innovation

In examining users' and evaluators' descriptions of their involvement with the evaluation process, we began to recognize that we had been misinterpreting what appeared be a systematic abuse of the ideal evaluation process envisioned by the rational mandates and established research traditions (see also Hall, 1982). This year's return to the school district, along with our earlier studies (King, Thompson & Pechman, 1981; King & Pechman, 1982), showed that the process of conducting local school evaluations is more baffling to practitioners in school districts than we had realized (see also Kennedy, Apling, & Newman, 1980). Lack of understanding partly explains the resistance to using the available evaluation models that emerged in the heyday of the 1960s and 1970s (Comfort, 1982; Eash, 1985a; Shapiro, 1985; Stake, 1985).

As we looked more closely at our data and listened to the people in schools, we began to recognize that conducting and using evaluations in school settings constitute a major innovative effort and should be analyzed and understood in that light. The hesitant, even obstructive, responses of educational systems to innovation are well documented in the literature (Comfort, 1982; Havelock, 1971; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, & Wehlage, 1982; Wolcott, 1977). A longer look at the use of evaluation in the school system revealed that the impact of evaluation mandates was, like other major innovations in recent years, very slowly taking root. As with the earlier innovations, the evaluation "idea champions" -- in this case the professional evaluation specialists and the district's policy makers, top managers and federal program monitors -- had greater expectations for the evaluation process than did either the evaluators or users who had to resolve the practitical day-to-day implementation problems, and, not surprisingly, the practitioners' more gradual approach controlled what we actually observed in schools.

The developmental evolution of school innovation adoption has been described by Hall and his colleagues at the University of Texas R & D Center (Hall, Wallace, & Dossett, 1973; Hall et al., 1975). It begins with users' concerns about a particular innovation and involves adjusting their feelings, attitudes and worries as a first step in the adoption process. As the personal concerns of individual practitioners are addressed, they evolve through several stages, from a lack of knowledge about the innovation and how to use it to the development of skills necessary for the routine use of the innovation. Ultimately, the use of the innovation is refined and incorporated into the ongoing structure of the system.

Implementing evaluations that use rational analytical processes requires a good deal of on-site program staff. For many, it means new skills need to be learned and practiced, and there are inevitable mistakes to be made. This process is painful, particularly because there is not much tolerance for learning by mistake in bureaucratic systems. Thus, when the evaluation process is incorporated into a new program, its successful use depends on the staff's openness to working closely with the process. The ideal of evaluation use envisions school site personnel coordinating closely with evaluation teams, applying rational and analytical procedures at all levels of instructional decision making to support continual school and program improvement, but the practice falls far short of the ideal.

How do we move people and systems beyond their current levels of understanding of the evaluation use process? Where do we begin?

The Structure of School Evaluation Use

This return after three years to look at the evaluation use process in a large school district revealed a more optimistic picture of evaluation use in school districts if we expect a developing process, rather than a static ideal. We can better comprehend apparent failures to use evaluation information in predictable ways that adhere to a scientific rationality when we see the process as continually evolving, at different paces in each program, and in unique patterns depending on the individuals responsible for implemention.

The original naturalistic data from our sample district, gathered between 1980 and 1982 (King & Pechman, 1982; 1984), and this year's return to the study site defined the evaluation use problem and allowed us to see the underlying rational structure. The evolutionary process we observed is described in The Structure of School Evaluation Use --SSEU (Appendix A), the framework we developed from our grounded data . The SSEU is an instrument that considers school evaluation use as an innovation. We combined our findings about the process of evaluation use in schools with the way innovations are received as described in Hall and Loucks' Levels of Use of Innovations -- LoU (see Appendix B; Hall, 1982; Hall and Loucks, 1975). Our purpose is to identify accurately the evolutionary stages in which the evaluation process is implemented so, ultimately, we can help schools use the evaluation process more rationally.

This framework describes the behavior of individual users of the evaluation process and of evaluation information in schools and school systems. It shows the evolutionary structure that users follow in developing sophistication in their use of evaluations. Our longitudinal data, combined with the observations reported in numerous studies of school evaluation use, indicated a whole range of responses to the process of implementing and using school evaluations (Alkin, Daillak, & White, 1979; Comfort, 1982; Cooley & Bickel, 1986; Cousins & Leithwood,

1985; King & Pechman, 1982). By seeking and defining consistencies in the ways practitioners use the evaluation process, we will have a better understanding of how to conduct evaluations to assure they respond to each user's needs.

The Structure of School Evaluation Use consists of six major levels of evaluation use that go from "nonuse" of evaluation to "renewal." We examined our three years of field notes and set them against the LoU to arrive at the specifications for stages of evaluation use, the "decision points" that mark a user's movement between stages, and the behavioral indicators describing the key functions characteristic of users at the highest levels of use. Our focus was on the evaluation activity of program coordinators and directors, and, only to a limited degree, on teachers.

Nonuse is defined as a preliminary stage in which the user is unaware of the potential usefulness of evaluation and the evaluation process and does not look for information to support program implementation. This level of use is not particularly common in schools, since school people have become increasingly sensitive to the expectation that schooling should be involved in a continuing evaluation process.

Once potential users take action to learn more about the requirements or procedures for conducting an evaluation, they have moved to Stage I, Orientation. At this stage, users are exploring the ideas about evaluation and are considering how evaluation might fit the needs of their own programs. When they initiate the evaluation process by a specific action, such as calling for a design or the consultation of an evaluator, they have moved to Stage II, Preparation.

Preparation continues the preevaluation process. The users may recognize the need to collect data for an evaluation but, not knowing quite how to do it, they assign the task to a staff person, vaguely expecting to receive feedback, but not quite certain what to expect. When users take their first steps toward reviewing the data and combine that review with a serious effort to use the information, even informally and simply, they have moved toward Stages IIIA and IIIb, Mechanical Use and Routine Use.

Mechanical Use and Routine Use are two substages within this phase. They are similar, but represent increasingly sophisticated uses of the evaluation process. These two levels are the levels of evaluation use that we most frequently observed in our study among experienced project directors. The latter substage, Routine Use, consists of a more complex application of the basic data that is collected in the Mechanical Use phase. As in the LoU framework, Routine Use is the minimal desired level of achievement. But Routine Use of the educational evaluation process is short of the most ideal form of use because it does not reach into the daily teaching or managing structure of program implementation. Routine Use employs evaluation in a unidimensional manner, as an

indicator or signal to external sponsors that programs are proceeding according to timelines.

At the highest levels of use, there is a continuing evaluation process in place that is consistent with more rational models of evaluation-based decision making. Stage IV, Refinement, begins to incorporate the use of evaluation information to make substantive program changes, but, at this stage, the use of information is restricted. This type of evaluation use has been called "charged use" -- like ions in a chemical equation, evaluation information takes on a charge -- and has the potential to cause a reaction in the system or program being evaluated (King & Pechman, 1982; 1984). Evaluators and users work collaboratively at this stage and at other higher stages, designing evaluations to fit program needs more closely.

Stage V, Integration, occurs when a user tries to make more specific program changes in direct response to the evaluators' feedback. The entire process of evaluation, from its inception through the systematically planned use of evaluation, is better coordinated than in earlier stages. The program coordinator designs the program to incorporate evaluation throughout, but has not yet succeeded in fully institutionalizing it into the program and still personally guides most of the staff's practical applications of the evaluation process.

Finally, Stage VI, Renewal, describes the user who continually evaluates the evaluation process itself to assure it is adequately serving programmatic needs and adjusts and modifies the evaluation when necessary. The evaluation process is continuous and well integrated into the program's structure. It is comprehensive and reaches all levels of management, staff and clients. Political realities and limitations notwithstanding, Renewal decision makers -- who can include any leader, teachers, project coordinators, principals, district level managers, superintendents, and school board members -- expect evaluation information, routinely take action to obtain it, analyze its application and practicality, and, in some rational way, use it.

Data from our study of this sample district indicated an interesting pattern of evaluation use. There were many users, especially new principals and teachers, at the Orientation and Preparation levels and only a few users were at the higher levels. The actions of principals and directors or coordinators of special programs programs typically fit the Preparation stage and did not reach Mechanical Use except in cases of project directors who had lengthy experience in federal programs. Nevertheless, arrival at the stage of Preparation shows that there has been growth in this system during the years we have observed. Nonuse of evaluation was the standard when our study began, although, at that time, evaluation had been mandated in the district by federal and local school administrators for almost ten years.

While there is still a predominance of the Routine or lower levels of use, the data document gradual changes in the ways that primary users in this district view evaluation and incorporate it into their program management functions. Test score use is a good example of this evolution. At the beginning of this study, there was wide variation in the interest in test scores, with many school principals simply shelving them as they came, never really certain what "those computer sheets" said, and not very interested in finding out. Now, all the principals and teachers we interviewed expect tests in the spring and scores in September. The scores are sought in chart form so they can be distributed at start-up fall meetings. Although the upper levels of use are still uncommon, the most successful school principals and teachers use test data creatively and proactively, along with other supportive information about individual children, special groups, and programs -- at the Renewal level.

This instrument is designed to describe the evaluation use behavior of individuals, but it can also be applied to the district level. In our sample district, Routine use of evaluation has often been accomplished, at least in regard to the basic instructional program in reading and mathematics. School years are planned around testing cycles; associate superintendents call for accountability plans that include reviewing test information and targeted goals that reference test data. Many routine meetings now include the use of surveys and evaluations of how well agendas are accomplished. These surveys are usually very simple and may neglect to elicit critical evaluations of substance. Nevertheless, their use indicates beginning understanding of the ways evaluation can contribute to program development.

In addition to defining the six stages of evaluation use, this draft of the Structure of School Evaluation Use also sets out an initial list of behavioral indicators -- Categories of Use -- that describe different components of the evaluation use process (Appendix A, Part II). Still building on the Texas R & D system, we observed seven categories similar to those identified by Hall and Loucks (Ibid.). Each category describes key actions that are specific to the evaluation use process. They are: planning, assessing, acquiring, knowing, managing, collaborating, and committing. Part II of Appendix A gives examples of the behavioral indicators within each category that are characteristic of individuals at the highest levels of evaluation use. As this research continues, we will return to the original data base to identify the additional behaviors within each category that are typical of individuals functioning at each of the six stages.

Applications of the Structure of School Evaluation Use

The next steps in the development of the Structure of School Evaluation Use are to determine its applicability through pilot testing and to refine it for practical use. We submit it at this phase in its development for comments and suggestions from colleagues who have been

close to the issues related to the limits of school evaluation use. We believe it can be most helpful to evaluators and decision makers in determining the type of evaluation that would best suit a given school program context.

Training of evaluators to assess clients' levels of potential ability to use the evaluation process will increase the likelihood that evaluations will be designed and conducted so they more closely meet users' abilities and awareness. If staff level coordinators, directors, and principals are not able to use evaluation information except at initial use levels, only modified and limited evaluation designs are required. Evaluators will be in a better position to promote increasingly constructive evaluations if they can assess the context and work at the various developmental stages of their users. Over time, understanding and working collaboratively within an individual's readiness to use the evaluation process assure that the evaluations in schools will be more effectively and continually used.

To experienced school district evaluators, this structure and the observations we make here may state the obvious. We have seen that most effective LEA evaluators intuitively understand and spontaneously use a developmental framework to assess the evaluation context and to design their evaluations accordingly (Patton, 1978). Successful evaluators know that when project directors and evaluators, or evaluation directors, superintendents, and school boards work collaboratively, in well-matched relationships, they develop mutual understandings of how best to incorporate the evaluation process into the organization and program structure. The "levels of evaluation use" concept is therefore not new to experienced and effective evaluators, but, like much street level knowledge, its reality is only informally recognized in the evaluation use literature.

Evaluation Is Worth the Effort

This approach to understanding and assessing the process of school evaluation use assumes that adopting evaluation processes within school districts requires a new way of doing things. As with other innovations, integrating evaluation into complex school organizations is evolutionary. When the evaluation process becomes fully used, carefully established equilibria among individuals and subsystems in the organization will inevitably be disrupted, and disruption is never easy.

Although we lament school systems' resistance to the rational use of the evaluation process, we have recognized that, in spite of our frustration with the pace, the process has been incorporated gradually and in piecemeal fashion into many aspects of school life, in the classroom and at district levels. Progress is evident if we look back to the 1960s when evaluation was first mandated as part of the program implementation process. Evaluation units in school districts are increasingly accepted components of the school bureaucratic structure; instructional

assessment and standardized testing are routinely expected by children, teachers and the community; program evaluation training is provided in universities and colleges; and state legislatures are mandating evaluation procedures much as did the federal government in the late 1960s. Principals, even teachers, now occasionally pick up the phone to invite the district's evaluation specialist to help interpret test information or to design a simple evaluation for a pet program. Even more exciting is the increasing number of complex and longitudinal evaluation studies reported each year by school district evaluation units. Look, for example, at the annual submissions of district level evaluations sponsored by AERA's Division H. The number and quality of submissions grow annually.

The improvements we have seen in evaluation methodology and in the technology that supports the evaluation process show the potential value of continuing to require that educational programs be evaluated. However, we have to become more adaptable and creative in our use of the process. Although bottom line recommendations and changes that respond directly to evaluation findings may be the exception, not the rule, a broader understanding of the evaluation process and its evolution among individual users recognizes that, given the opportunity and the proper support, the evaluation process will, indeed, become gradually structured into educational and program development routines.

A systematic evaluation model such as the Structure of School Evaluation can help in assessing the status of evaluation use in school settings. Used diagnostically by evaluators, decision makers, trainers, and change agents, it can direct planning so that program activities are designed to move individuals and the organization towards more complex stages of evaluation use.

Our longitudinal study of evaluation use in process allows us to more optimistically answer the questions with which we began. But, to do so requires that we recognize the incremental ways that school evaluation processes are contributing to the evolution of more rational educational decision making. The key is, first, to design mechanisms that assure the evaluation use process is implemented routinely into school programs and, ultimately, to build into accountability models the expectation and requirement that educational systems refine and renew the evaluation process continually.

Looked at with this developmental perspective, recognizing the evolutionary nature of the process, we see that the evaluation process in schools can be worth the effort and that it falls to the evaluator to make it so.

APPENDIX A

THE STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE (SSEU)

Ellen M. Pechman and Jean A. King

(Adapted from Hall, 1982, and Hall & Loucks, 1975)

Introductory Note:

The levels of evaluation use defined below assume that users and evaluators are ethicial, motivated by good intentions, and adhere to established professional norms and standards. Intentional abuse and misuse are independent levels of evaluation use that have been documented as part of the evaluation process (Ginsberg, 1984; King & Pechman, 1982; Lipsky, 1978) and are always potentially a problem. We recognize abuse and misuse of the evaluation process as a predictable side effect of unreasonable, irrational, or rigid bureaucratic expectations and requirements regarding program performance and/or evaluation. When "street level" (Lipsky, 1978) staff are called upon to demonstrate their program's success through excessive record keeping or arbitrary data collection requirements and without sufficient personal, professional, or resource support, evaluation abuse or misuse can easily occur (Ginsberg, 1984).

Evaluation abuse refers to the behaviors of evaluation users that break professional norms and use the evaluation process inappropriately. Abuse includes actions that are altruistically intended, but misdirected (e.g., erasing students' test answers or artificially reducing pretest scores), and those prompted by personal weakness and/or fear. Malevolent use of evaluation information has also been observed and is included in this category.

The reality of evaluation abuse and misuse must be acknowledged and explored, and we should seek the reasons for their occurrence so steps can be taken to minimize such destructive fallout or "side effects" (Ginsberg, 1984) of the evaluation process.

STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE

Part I: Levels of School Evaluation Use

0 Nonuse

User ignores evaluation process or is unaware of its potential use and does not seek it out. Evaluation information is not integrated into program implementation.

Decision Point I: User takes action to learn more about the requirements and procedures for conducting an evaluation.

I. Orientation

User begins to explore the potential value of the evaluation process and takes steps to acquire information about how to conduct an evaluation. Orientation may be initiated because of a grant or program mandate for an evaluation component in a new program; requirements established by a higher level manager; or user awareness of the potential value of the evaluation process to support, defend, or demonstrate the success of an ongoing program.

Decision Point II: User decides to initiate the evaluation process by calling for a review of an evaluation design and by taking action to determine what must be done to meet the requirements of the evaluation design.

II. Preparation

User recognizes the need to collect data and directs staff to begin data collection, but remains aloof from the process, disregarding it during implementation, except when required to approve procedural activities or requirements. The evaluation is assigned to staff to implement, and data may be included in reports, but user is not aware of how to analyze or apply data other than as a signal to be reported as mandated.

Decision Point IIIA: User begins first use of evaluation by reviewing data, requesting assistance in interpreting evaluation, or including information from evaluation in conversations with staff and in staff meetings, reports, or planning.

IIIA. Mechanical Use

User employs evaluation in required ways -- e.g., mandated reporting, distributing simple summaries of information and key data with other program documents. Allows evaluation process to proceed, but does not attend to quality of data collection process, giving only lip service to the place of evaluation in program implementation, planning or change.

Decision Point IIIB: Routine of evaluation implementation and use is established within program. Data collection and simple evaluation reporting for signal purposes are regular features of annual program implementation timelines and activity.

IIIB. Routine Use

User routinely employs the signal function of the evaluation process and reports information regularly at mandated or logical points. Program planning and implementation include a skeleton evaluation process in which simple quantitative reports are submitted at required intervals to higher managerial levels and to staff. User fails to implement a systematic organizational use of the evaluation process and employs the information generated by the process in limited, nondynamic ways.

Decision Point IV: This marks the beginning of charged use. Managers change program elements, planning procedures, and/or program components on the basis of formal or informal evaluation information to improve the program and increase client outcomes.

IV. Refinement

Beginning of charged use, i.e., data are systematically used to make program changes. There is an attempt to mold the evaluation process to provide information needed for program-specific decisions. The evaluation process is altered as needed to meet the client's needs and to assure data are available to guide program changes. Decision makers begin to seek out usable evaluation information by modifying the evaluation design as necessary and by providing staff time and personnel to assure that data are systematically generated and dependably reported. In short, the decision maker's stated commitment to evaluation use is turned into initial action (beginning stages of putting theory into practice).

Decision Point V: User initiates use of evaluation information by coordinating with staff and/or colleagues to take action for program changes that are recommended or implied in the recommendations from the evaluators' informal feedback and from more formal evaluation data and reports.

V. Integration

Implements higher levels of charged use by supporting the evaluation process both verbally and through managerial actions. Evaluation information that is collected is carefully determined on the basis of realistic assessments of available staff time to collect, analyze and actually use information obtained. User carefully collects data that is relevant and accurate and modifies reports for practical use by various audiences. Data are routinely disseminated and responded to by audiences; colleagues collaborate to assure that evaluation information is interpreted, understood and distributed. Program changes are monitored and, to the extent possible, are made in light of the evaluation findings.

Decision Point VI: User begins exploring program alternatives or major modifications called for by the evaluation and the evaluation process: Initiates major planning efforts; recommends substantive curricular; budget, or staffing changes on the basis of evaluation data; and includes extended and well-integrated evaluation process as a center-core of the program's functioning.

VI. Renewal

User continually evaluates the evaluation process, assuring that evaluation is the basis of action at every stage, from design planning through data definition, collection procedures, reporting, and program modification. A delicate balance is struck that recognizes practical limitations and possibilities and weighs them against bold actions so that the 'most evaluation for the buck' is obtained from the resources that are available. Evaluator or decision maker knows what the evaluation process can yield and works to assure that information is available and of high quality. User and evaluator routinely confer to obtain continual information on new developments from the field and in the literature, and collaboratively recommend ways to improve program, whether the news is good or bad. The evaluation process is comprehensive and attempts to reach all levels (top managers through front-line staff implementers and audiences/clients). Ideally,

at all levels, from teacher-child interaction through directors to the top manager-director interaction, both quantitative and qualitative evaluation data, combined with sensitive and practical interpretation -- recognizing political realities and limitations -- are the foundations of actions.

STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL EVALUATION USE

Part II: Categories of Use and Sample Behavioral Indicators

The following categories of behavioral indicators are based on those presented in the Levels of Use (Hall, et al.,1975). These categories are specific to the evaluation use process and have been developed on the basis of field data from the longitudinal study of school evaluation use. The evaluation categories describe the key functions characteristic of users at the highest levels of use.

1: Planning - Designs and outlines short and/or long range steps to be taken during process of evaluation, that is, aligns resources, schedules activities, and meets with others to organize and/or to coordinate evaluation use. This effectively initiates the institutionalization of the evaluation process by committing resources and time.

2: Assessing - Examines potential or actual use of evaluation or some aspect of it; designs the evaluation processes, products, and uses; analyzes data; and conducts meta evaluations. This can be a mental assessment or can involve actual collection and analysis of data.

3: Acquiring-- Solicits information about evaluation in various ways, including questioning resource people, corresponding with resource agencies, reviewing printed materials, and making visits; collects available products; reviews reports; seeks additional data and evaluation information as needed.

4: Knowing -- Refers to the information that the user has about evaluation and the evaluation process, how to use it, and consequences of its use: awareness of information needs; evaluation potential; how to collect, interpret and use data; technical issues; and knowledge of the evaluation process. This category refers to cognitive knowledge about the evaluation process and about how to use the evaluation information. Feelings or attitudes are not included in this category.

5: Managing (*Hall's 'Performing') - Carries out the actions and activities entailed in operationalizing evaluation: puts theory into action; uses clout and political context continuously and effectively; turns information into action; through effective monitoring and directing, teaches others to do same; follows through on implementation of evaluation at all levels; and uses organizational roles and functions to affect evaluation process.

6: Collaborating (*Hall's 'Sharing') - Discusses evaluation with others. Shares plans, ideas, resources, outcomes, and problems related to evaluation use: collaborates with key institutional units and with key personnel; reports to others; and holds meetings to exchange information and to facilitate use of evaluation results.

7: Committing (*Hall's Status Reporting) - Describes personal stand in relation to evaluation use: demonstrates willingness to take a stand, uses information with key audiences and personnel, and advertises program evaluation process as key component.

APPENDIX B

LEVELS OF USE OF THE INNOVATION

From: The LoU Chart. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

0 NONUSE	State in which the user has little or no knowledge of the innovation, no involvement with the innovation, and is doing nothing toward becoming involved.
Decision Point A	Takes action to learn more detailed information about the innovation.
I ORIENTATION	State in which the user has recently acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation and/or has recently explored or is exploring its value orientation and its demands upon user and user system.
Decision Point B	Makes a decision to use the innovation by establishing a time to begin.
II PREPARATION	State in which the user is preparing for first use of the innovation.
Decision Point C	Changes, if any, and use are dominated by user needs.
III MECHANICAL USE	State in which the user focuses most effort on the short-term, day-to-day use of the innovation with little time for reflection. Changes in use are made more to meet user needs than client needs. The user is primarily engaged in a stepwise attempt to master the tasks required to use the innovation, often resulting in disjointed and superficial use.
Decision Point D-1	A routine pattern of use is established.
IVA ROUTINE	Use of the innovation is stabilized. Few, if any, changes are being made in ongoing use. Little preparation or thought is being given to improving innovation use or its consequences.
Decision Point D-2	Changes use of the innovation based on formal or informal evaluation in order to increase client outcomes.
IVB REFINEMENT	State in which the user varies the use of the innovation to increase the impact on clients within the immediate sphere of influence. Variations are based on knowledge of both short- and long-term consequences for clients.
Decision Point E	Initiates changes in use of innovation based on input of and in coordination with what colleagues are doing.
V INTEGRATION	State in which the user is combining own efforts to use the innovation with related activities of colleagues to achieve a collective impact on clients within their common sphere of influence.
Decision Point F	Begins exploring alternatives to or major modifications of the innovation presently in use.
VI RENEWAL	State in which the user reevaluates the quality of use of the innovation, seeks major modifications of or alternatives to present innovation to achieve increased impact on clients, examines new developments in the field, and explores new goals for self and the system.

Bibliography

Alkin, M.C., Daillak, R. & White, P. Using Evaluations: Does Evaluation Make a Difference? Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979.

Bank, A. & Williams, R.C. Evaluation In School Districts: Organizational Perspectives. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation, No. 10. Los Angeles: Center for Study of Evaluation, 1981.

Benveniste, G. The design of school accountability systems. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 261-279.

Berman, P. The study of macro- and micro-implementation. Public Policy, 26(2), 1978, 170-174.

Berman, P. Thinking about programmed and adaptive implementation: Matching strategies to situations. In H.M. Ingram & D.E. Mann (Eds.), Why Policies Succeed or Fail. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980, 205-228.

Berman, et al., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vols. I - VIII. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1974-1978.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. 1: A Model for Educational Change. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, 1974.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Implementation of educational innovation. Educational Forum, 40, 345-370.

Borman, K.M. & Spring, J.H. Schools in central cities: Structure and process. New York: Longman, Inc., 1984.

Braskamp, L.A. A definition of use. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 8(2), 169-174.

Brinkerhoff, R.O., et al. Program Evaluation: A Practioner's Guide for Trainers and Educators (Sourcebook). Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing, 1983.

Cohen, D.K. & Lindblom, C.E. Solving problems of bureaucracy: Limits on social science. In C.H. Weiss and A.H. Barton (Eds.), Making Bureaucracies Work. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980, 125-138.

Comfort, L.K. Evaluation as an instrument for educational change. In H.M. Ingram & D.E. Mann (Eds.). Why Policies Succeed or Fail. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980, 35-57.

Comfort, L. K. Education Policy and Evaluation: A Context for Change. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Cooley, W. & Bickel, W. Decision-Oriented Educational Research. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1986.

Cousins, J. B. & Leithwood, K.A. The state of the art of empirical research on evaluation utilization. Prepublication draft. Ontario Institute for Studies in Evaluation, 1985.

Eckstein, H. & Gurr, T.R. Patterns of Authority: A Structural Basis for Political Inquiry. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Eash, M.J. Evaluation research and program evaluation: Retrospect and prospect. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985a, 237-252.

Eash, M.J. A reformulation of the role of the evaluator. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985b, 237-238.

Ginsberg, P.E. The dysfunctional side effects of qualitative indicator production: Illustrations from mental health care (A message from Chicken Little). Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 1984, 1-12.

Hall, G.E. Viewing evaluation utilization as an innovation. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 8(2), 1982, 185-196.

Hall, G.E., et al. Levels of use of the innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. Journal of Teacher Education, 26(1), 1975, 52-56.

Hall, G.E. & Loucks, S.F. A developmental model for determining whether the treatment is actually implemented. American Educational Research Journal, 14(3), 263-276.

Hall, G.E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W.A. A Developmental Conceptualization of the Adoption Process within Educational Institutions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1976.

Havelock, R.G. Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1971.

Hood, P.D. The view of a program director. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 238-242.

Jackson, P.W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, C.,, 1968.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.

Kennedy, M.M., Apling, R. & Neumann, W. F. The Role of Evaluation and Test Information in Public Schools. Cambridge: The Huron Institute, 1980.

King, J.A. & Pechman, E. M. Pinning a wave to the shore: Conceptualizing evaluation use in school systems. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6(3), 1984, 241-251.

King, J.A. & Pechman, E. M. The Process of Evaluation Use in Local School Settings. Final Report. National Institute of Education Grant (81-0900). New Orleans, Louisiana: New Orleans Public Schools, 1982.

Lindblom, C.E. & Cohen, D.K. Usable Knowledge: Social Science and Social Problem Solving. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Lipsky, M. The assault on human services: Street-level bureaucrats, accountability and the fiscal crisis. In D. Greer, R. Hedlund, & J. Gibson. Accountability in Urban Society: Public Agencies Under Fire. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978, 15-38.

Merwin, J.C. & Wiener, P.H. Evaluation: A profession? Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 253-259.

Olsen, L.M. & Gordon, A.C. Reflections on Ginsberg's Paper. Evaluation and Program Planning, 7, 1984, 19-21.

Patton, M. Utilization Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1978.

Perloff, R.M., Padgett, V.R., & Timothy, C.B. Sociocognitive biases in the evaluation process. New Directions for Program Evaluation, 7, 1980, 11-26.

Popkewitz, T.S., Tabachnick, B.R. & Wehlage, G. The Myth of Educational Reform: A Study of School Responses to a Program of Change. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

Sabatier, P. & Mazmanian, D. The implementation of public policy: A framework of analysis (Xerox copy, No date).

Shapiro, J.Z. Where we are and where we need to go. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 245-248.

Stake, R.E. A personal interpretation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 7(3), 1985, 243-244.

Wolcott, H.F. Teachers Versus Technocrats: An Educational Innovation in Anthropological Perspective. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977.